

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

### Introduction

Located in north-central New Mexico in the foothills of the Jemez Mountains on the Pajarito Plateau, the Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks (KKTR) National Monument is situated in Sandoval County. It lies about 35 miles southwest of Santa Fe and 52 miles northeast of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared this draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to provide guidance for managing the federal lands within the KKTR National Monument. Within the monument boundary are approximately 5,402 acres. In this plan, the 5,402 acre area is also referred to as the "Decision Area." The Decision Area is composed of approximately 4,124 acres of federal (public) lands, 521 acres of land owned by the State of New Mexico and 757 acres of private surface.

Adjoining the monument are two parcels of private land that have resource values similar to those of the monument. To the southwest is a parcel containing approximately 965 acres, while along the northern boundary is a parcel known as the Cañada de Cochiti Grant (or Young Ranch) that contains approximately 9,268 acres.

### Background

The KKTR National Monument was designated a monument by Presidential Proclamation on January 17, 2001. Before its designation as a national monument, the same area was designated by the BLM as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) through the *Rio Puerco Resource Management Plan* (USDI, BLM 1986; maintained and reprinted 1992; amended) to protect its unique geologic formations, and scenic and cultural values. Management was guided by the 1986 Rio Puerco Resource

Management Plan, as amended, and the *Final Protection Plan for Tent Rocks, An Area of Critical Environmental Concern* (USDI, BLM 1987).

The BLM initiated a management agreement with the Pueblo de Cochiti in 1997. In 2000, the two entities signed an Inter-Government Cooperative Agreement to provide for more consistent, effective and collaborative management of the Tent Rocks ACEC. These agreements give consideration to the Pueblo de Cochiti's interests in aboriginal lands, and their cultural ties to the lands, animals and plants of the area.

Since the designation of the monument in 2001, numerous projects have been carried out, in cooperation with the Pueblo de Cochiti, to improve visitor services, the health of the land, and road access through the Pueblo and to the main parking/picnic area, as well as to reduce hazardous fuels. Many of the visitor service facilities, such as restrooms, tables and shelters, were purchased and installed with revenues collected at the Tent Rocks fee site, where 100 percent of the fees are returned to the fee site for management, improvement and operation of the site.

### Purpose and Need

Presidential Proclamation 7394 designated Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument to protect geologic, cultural, and biological objects of interest and to provide an opportunity to observe, study, and experience the unique geologic processes found in the area. The proclamation requires the BLM to prepare a management plan for the monument in close cooperation with the Pueblo de Cochiti. The monument is a unit of the BLM National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS). Under the BLM's current planning policy, the agency must prepare a Resource Management Plan for the monument that is separate from any other plan (a "stand-alone plan").

Policy further requires that the RMP be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The EIS will disclose to the public and BLM managers any impacts to the environment that would likely result from implementing the agency's Proposed Action or possible alternatives. The decisions made through this planning process will apply only to federal lands administered by the BLM within the monument, and to nonfederal lands within the monument boundary identified in the proclamation for acquisition, if and when they are acquired. Those nonfederal lands within the present monument boundary would, upon acquisition, become part of the monument.

## Issues

In the BLM planning process, an issue is defined as a matter of controversy, conflict or general concern over resource management activities, the environment or land uses. In essence, issues help determine what decisions need to be made in the plan and what the environmental analysis must address. Because Proclamation 7394 sets limits on how the monument is to be managed, and the area is small compared to most other units within the NLCS, conflicts among resource uses that need to be resolved are not evident. Based on the scoping comments received and internal input, five major planning issues were identified that were considered in the development of alternatives. Those issues are listed below.

Issue 1: **Land tenure adjustments** and how land ownership will be incorporated into the management plan for the monument.

Issue 2: How **Access and transportation** will be managed in the monument.

Issue 3: How **recreational activities** and visitor use will be managed.

Issue 4: How **ecosystem restoration** will benefit the public and the monument.

Issue 5: How **American Indian uses and traditional cultural practices** will be incorporated into the management of the monument.

## Management Alternatives

The BLM land use planning regulations and NEPA require the agency to develop a range of reasonable alternatives during the planning process. Through public scoping meetings and guidance from the proclamation, consultation with the Pueblo de Cochiti and internal input from internal specialists, the BLM developed three alternatives, including a "no action" alternative, and analyzed them for potential environmental impacts. The three alternatives describe various ways the provisions of the proclamation would be applied to direct management of the monument. Each of the three alternatives presented in this document has a different blend or balance of resource allocations, uses and protection. Each alternative has a somewhat different emphasis, primarily defined in terms of resource focus, but all afford the high degree of protection required by the proclamation for the monument's resources and objects of interest. A summary of actions proposed under each of the following alternatives, together with the resulting impacts, can be found in Table ES-1 at the end of this narrative.

### Alternative A

Alternative A is the No Action Alternative, representing the continuation of the existing management plans, policies and decisions established in the 1986 Rio Puerco RMP, as amended, and as implemented through the Tent Rocks ACEC Protection Plan, that are in compliance with the proclamation. Alternative A also serves as the baseline for comparison with the other two alternatives.

## Alternative B

Alternative B represents the agency's proposed resource use and conservation alternative. The agency's focus would be to make resource allocations that would resolve the resource use issues and management concerns associated with the monument, while complying with the proclamation and current BLM policies, initiatives and guidance.

## Alternative C

Alternative C emphasizes an adaptive management approach (particularly for recreation management) with the inclusion of additional monitoring. Of the three alternatives, this alternative represents the highest accommodation of visitor access to and within the monument and highest potential for facility development. The goals for the monitoring and evaluation program would be to provide the basis for long-term adaptive management changes and ongoing planning. The monitoring results would trigger management changes to maximize recreational use, facility development, and the visitors' beneficial experiences while minimizing natural resource degradation and depletion.

### **Proclamation Management Requirements (All Alternatives)**

Specific language in the proclamation establishes some conditions that apply to management of the monument regardless of which alternative (or combination of alternatives) the BLM chooses. These conditions include the following.

- All federal lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the KKTR National Monument are withdrawn from all forms of entry, location, selections, sale, leasing or other disposition under the public land laws. This withdrawal applies under (but is not limited to) the mining laws and all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing. The only exception to this withdrawal would

be an exchange that would further the protective purposes of the monument.

- The use of all motorized and mechanized vehicles off road is prohibited, except for emergency or authorized administrative purposes.
- Lands and interests in lands within the national monument not owned by the United States are reserved as a part of the monument if title to them is acquired by the United States.
- The BLM will manage the monument in close cooperation with the Pueblo de Cochiti.
- The management plan for the monument will include appropriate transportation planning that addresses the actions, including road closures or travel restrictions, needed to protect the geologic, cultural, and biological objects of interest identified in the proclamation and to further the purposes of the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of August 11, 1978 (Title 42 of the U.S. Code, Section 1996).
- The Secretary of the Interior will retire the portion of the grazing allotments within the monument, under applicable laws, unless livestock grazing will advance the purposes of the proclamation.
- Nothing in the proclamation enlarges or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State of New Mexico over fish and wildlife management.
- The monument is subject to valid existing rights.
- The proclamation did not reserve water as a matter of federal law. However, any water use or rights reserved or appropriated by the United States on or before the date of the proclamation are not reduced or relinquished. The Secretary of the Interior

will work with appropriate state authorities to ensure that any water resources needed for monument purposes are available.

- Nothing in the proclamation revokes any existing withdrawal, reservation, or appropriation; however, the national monument is the dominant reservation.
- No person may use, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of this monument without authorization, nor locate nor settle upon any of the lands.

### **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives**

Some existing actions, decisions, and guidelines under which the ACEC has been managed have effectively met public needs and/or resolved issues, so the BLM will continue to use them in the monument. These are brought forward from the *Rio Puerco Resource Management Plan* (USDI, BLM 1986; maintained and reprinted 1992) and the *Final Protection Plan for Tent Rocks, An Area of Critical Environmental Concern* (USDI, BLM 1987) and are described below. Other resource or program management guidance that would be used under any alternative also is included in this section.

#### Access and Transportation

Roads will be closed if not needed for visitor use, safety or administrative purposes. BLM staff will determine restoration measures such as stabilization and reseeding to prevent soil erosion. Such “Best Management Practices” for minimizing sediment pollution will be developed and implemented on a site-specific basis.

#### Air Quality

All BLM actions and use authorizations will be designed and stipulated to protect air quality within the monument (including any acquired lands or lands managed under Cooperative Management Agreements) and the nearby

National Park Service Class I area, Bandelier National Monument.

#### American Indian Uses and Traditional Cultural Practices

The BLM will continue close coordination with the Pueblo de Cochiti in the day-to-day operations of the monument. For actions requiring an Environmental Assessment (EA) and/or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under NEPA, the BLM will consult with Cochiti, Santo Domingo, Jemez, and Zia Pueblos, as well as any tribes that may come forward later to express concern about traditional cultural properties, places, and uses in the monument. These tribes, plus the Jicarilla Apache Nation and the Hopi Tribe, will be included under any consultation required by the Archeological Resources Protection Act.

#### Cultural Resources

Under any alternative selected, the BLM will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act through procedures described in the “Protocol Agreement Between New Mexico Bureau of Land Management and New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer” (signed in June 2004) or any later agreements. The original agreement normally requires intensive archeological survey (BLM Class III inventory) of areas that would be directly affected by a project or action. If archeological resources are found, the preferred course of action is to redesign the project so that the remains are avoided. If this is not possible, the BLM will undertake data recovery or other measures developed in consultation with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer to reduce adverse impacts.

#### Environmental Justice

The BLM must identify, inform and consult with minority and low-income groups about federal actions that may affect them, and should not disproportionately impact these groups in an adverse way. Minority and low-income people will likely be affected by actions in the

monument. Therefore, they are being consulted and kept informed.

#### Fire Management

The proposed actions and priorities in the *Albuquerque Field Office Fire Management Plan* (FMP—USDI, BLM 2004a) and the *Resource Management Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management on Public Land in New Mexico and Texas* (USDI, BLM 2004b) apply to the monument and any acquired properties therein.

Through proposed vegetation treatments, the BLM will focus on moving the landscape toward the desired future condition of Fire Regime Condition (FRC) Class 1. The priority for the Planning Area will be to treat areas that are in FRC Classes 2 and 3; at this time no areas are in FRC Class 1. Vegetation on private lands will be treated only if these lands are acquired from willing sellers or managed under Cooperative Management Agreements.

#### Hazardous Materials/Solid Waste

No hazardous material or solid waste sites are known to exist within the Decision Area. The BLM relies on routine fieldwork activities and non-BLM sources to discover and report spills or other releases of hazardous materials/solid wastes on public lands. The agency investigates reported sites, and plans needed containment and/or cleanup responses on a case-by-case basis. Sites that are reported will be handled under current regulations, with potentially responsible parties identified and pursued based on best available information.

#### Lands and Realty

The BLM's ACEC Protection Plan included discussions of Cooperative Agreements with non-federal land owners who would provide land with uses complementary to the ACEC values. These values have now become monument values, and it is proposed that state and privately owned lands adjoining the monument be acquired whenever willing sellers are available.

#### Livestock Grazing

In accordance with Presidential Proclamation 7394, annual grazing use will be retired from federal land under the two federal grazing leases that exist within the Decision Area. Acreage closed to grazing will be fenced and range developments removed if they are not converted to another purpose (e.g., wildlife waters, recreational uses). Short-term grazing of forage on federal land within the monument will be allowed if the BLM determines it will advance the purposes of the proclamation. If such use is allowed, it is expected that it will be focused on helping to attain specific vegetative objectives.

#### Noxious Weed Control

One non-native, invasive weed species has been found on federal lands within the Decision Area. This is downy brome grass or "cheatgrass" (*Bromus tectorum*). This grass has spread throughout New Mexico and the Western United States, and the likelihood of successfully controlling it is low. Nevertheless, monitoring for noxious and invasive weeds and a vigorous treatment program will be a part of Decision Area management, in accordance with Standard Operating Procedures found in Instruction Memorandum NM-010-99-01 ("Noxious Weed Prevention Schedule for Albuquerque Field Office"—refer to Appendix B.) Any Cooperative Management Agreement that is developed for inholdings or edgeholdings would also include provisions for weed monitoring and treatment.

#### Paleontology

Although no fossil resources have been documented within the Decision Area boundary, if they are found there, the BLM will locate, evaluate, manage and protect them. The agency has an assistance agreement with the New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science. Under this agreement, anyone without a permit who finds vertebrate fossils on public land can bring them to the attention of the museum. This ensures the fossils will be available to the people of New Mexico and the United States.

The BLM will handle any such discoveries on a case-by-case basis.

#### Recreational Uses

The BLM will continue to manage the KKTR National Monument as a standard amenity fee site. The agency will collect, retain, and reinvest collected fees at this site under the authority of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-447.)

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act empower the BLM to issue Special Recreation Permits according to its own procedures and fee schedules for uses such as group activities, commercial recreational tours, and other special recreation uses. Issuing permits is mandatory for commercial and noncommercial recreation-related uses of BLM-administered federal lands. The BLM may also require permits for any uses in special areas like the monument where the agency determines that the law requires it.

#### Soil and Water Resources

Information on soil types will be used to properly locate facilities, as well as to establish visitor observation and interpretive opportunities. For roads and trails to be closed, agency soil and water specialists will recommend Best Management Practices to be used to minimize watershed impacts and/or restore natural conditions. These specialists will also analyze water availability and quality for visitor use, acquire water rights (if needed), and ensure continued compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act.

#### Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animals

The Endangered Species Act (Public Law 93-205), as amended (by Public Law 100-478), requires special protection and management of federally listed threatened and endangered (T&E) species, proposed and candidate plant and animal species (16 U.S.C. §§ 1531-1544; December 28, 1973, as amended 1976-82, 1984, 1988).

The BLM implements the ESA through its National Special Status Species Policy contained in the BLM Manual, Section 6840. This policy directs the agency to plan and implement programs to conserve T&E species, and to ensure that actions authorized, funded, or carried out do not jeopardize listed species or contribute to the need to list a species. This policy further charges BLM State Directors with the responsibility to give state-designated species the same level of protection as provided for federal candidate species.

The BLM has made a “No Affect” determination for all the listed, proposed, or candidate species identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as potentially occurring in Sandoval County, New Mexico. No current or potential habitat exists in the national monument to support these species.

Neither does the monument contain known critical or limiting habitat for other special-status wildlife species. However, the BLM has identified 13 sensitive species as potentially occurring or having suitable habitat within the Decision Area. The BLM will manage these species in accordance with the agency’s 6840 Manual.

#### Special-Status Plants

No special-status plant species is known to exist within the Decision Area or adjoining lands. Any plants located will be managed on a case-by-case basis.

#### Vegetation and Woodland Management

Where needed, vegetation and woodland treatments will consist of prescribed fire, mechanical methods, physical removal of excess vegetation, and chemical methods. The BLM will follow BLM Best Management Practices (BMPs) for vegetation treatment methods. Some treatments may need to be combined with others for the best results, and some areas may need to be treated repeatedly to achieve the desired results.

### Visual Resources

Both the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the National Environmental Policy Act require that federal lands be managed so as to protect the quality of the scenic values. BLM will continue to carry out its basic stewardship responsibilities to identify and protect visual values on the federal lands within the monument.

### Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas

No wildernesses or wilderness study areas exist within or immediately adjacent to the Decision Area. However, the Santa Fe National Forest's

Dome Wilderness and the National Park Service's Bandelier Wilderness adjoin the north edgeholding property which is part of the Planning Area. None of these special areas is expected to affect the others' resource values.

### **Environmental Impacts**

The potential environmental impacts of the alternatives are addressed for the various natural resources and land uses within the monument. Table ES-1, which follows, provides a summary of impacts related to all three alternatives considered, and Chapter 4 contains detailed analyses of these impacts.





TABLE ES-1

## ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON AND SUMMARY OF IMPACTS BY ISSUE

| ISSUE/Element or Factor  | ALTERNATIVE A   | ALTERNATIVE B   | ALTERNATIVE C  |
|--|---|---|--|
| <b>Issue 1: Land Tenure Adjustment</b><br>Easement Acquisition   | 1.05 miles for access through the monument, BLM Road 1011.  | Same as Alternative A, except acquisition of inholdings would eliminate the need for this easement.   | Same as Alternative B  |
| Cooperative Management Agreements (CMAs)   | Monument management on 1,278 acres of inholdings would be more effective with CMAs in place.                    | Replaced by acquisition from willing sellers.   | Same as Alternative B  |
| Land Acquisition<br>Inholdings—surface acres 1,278;<br>nonfederal mineral acres 837<br>Edgeholdings—surface acres 10,233;<br>nonfederal minerals acres 9,268 |   | Acquire for resource protection and effective monument management to:<br>Reduce recreation visitor trespass<br>Reduce potential for visual intrusions | Same as Alternative B  |
| <b>Issue 2: Access &amp; Transportation</b>  |   |   |  |
| Visitor use (visitors/year)  | 150,000   | 50,000  | 50,000   |
| Intensive recreation use (acres)   | 155   | 241   | 280  |
| Roaded Natural Areas (acres)   | 1,942   | 1,942   | 3,317  |
| Semi-Primitive Motorized (acres)   | 1,150   | 972   | 68   |
| Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (acres)   | 1,032   | 1,210   | 739  |
| Roads “Open” (miles)   | 18.11   | 6.05  | 9.15   |
| Roads open for “Limited” use (miles)   | 1.05  | 3.60  | 2.40   |
| Roads “Closed” (miles)   | 0.00  | 9.51  | 7.61   |
| Trails “Open” (miles)  | 8.26  | 7.92  | 9.66   |
| Trails “Closed” (miles)  | 0.40  | 2.14  | 0.40   |
| ORV/OHV Area<br>Designations (acres)<br>Open<br>Closed<br>Limited  | 0<br>0<br>4,124*  | 0<br>0<br>4,124*  | 0<br>0<br>4,124*   |
| Access to Highly Valued Traditional Use Area   | *(Limited to existing roads and trails)<br>Intrusion of 5.9 miles of improved road would cause loss of privacy. | *(Limited to designated roads and trails)<br>Intrusion of unimproved road access would be reduced by an estimated 3 to 5 miles.                       | *(Limited to designated roads and trails)<br>Intrusion of new access would create loss of privacy in highly valued traditional use area. |
| Trail Access   | 8.26 miles—would create the potential for damage & erosion to 175.7 acres of unique geologic features.          | 7.92 miles—would create the potential for damage & erosion to 369.2 acres of unique geologic features.  | 9.66 miles—would create the potential for damage & erosion to 369.2 acres of unique geologic features.                                   |
| Road Easement  | 1.05 miles—would be acquired for legal access through the monument.   | Same as Alternative A, except acquisition of inholdings would eliminate the need for this easement.   | Same as Alternative B  |
| Public Access (total road miles)   | 18.11   | 9.65  | 11.55  |
| Limited Access (total road miles)  | 1.05  | 3.60  | 2.40   |
| Motorized Access (acres)   | 2,892   | 2,914   | 3,385  |
| Dispersed Use Access (acres)   | 1,032   | 1,210   | 739  |

| ISSUE/Element or Factor   |  | ALTERNATIVE A   | ALTERNATIVE B  | ALTERNATIVE C   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Public Trails Access (miles)  |  | 8.26  | 7.92   | 9.66  |
| Watershed Stability & Water Quality (direct & indirect impacts)   |  | 19.16 miles of road   | 9.65 miles of road. Watershed stability & water quality would improve.   | 11.55 miles of road. Watershed stability & water quality would improve.   |
| Wildlife Habitat Fragmentation (per square mile of federal land)  |  | An average of approximately 2.98 miles of road & 1.28 miles of trails.  | An average of approximately 1.50 miles of road & 1.23 miles of trails.   | An average of approximately 1.79 miles of road & 1.50 miles of trails.  |
| <b>Issue 3—Recreational Activities</b><br>Facility Improvement & Maintenance  |  |   |  |   |
| Recreational Visits   |  | 5.9 miles of BLM Road 1011 through the monument. 155-acre intensive use area.   | Same as Alternative A, except the intensive use area would be enlarged to 241 acres, & a system would be developed for a safe & dependable public water supply.  | Same as Alternative B   |
| Cultural Resources (indirect impacts)   |  | Privacy would decrease & intrusion on traditional use & resource degradation would increase as visitation moved toward 150,000 visitors/year.<br>Illegal collection, cumulative & irreversible impacts may result in loss of sites. | Management would influence visitation to stabilize visitors at approximately 50,000/year to minimize intrusion & resource degradation.   | Same as Alternative B   |
| Prescribed Fire (as a management tool)  |  | Would have reduced effectiveness in the 155-acre intensive use area.  | Mitigated by increased inventory requirements.   | Same as Alternative B   |
| Unique Geologic Features  |  | Would have reduced effectiveness in the 155-acre intensive use area.<br>150,000 visitors/year would result in a high probability of damaging or destroying some unique geologic features on 175.7 federal acres in the monument.    | Would have reduced effectiveness in the 241-acre intensive use area.<br>50,000 visitors/year would reduce the probability of damage &/or destruction of unique geologic features on lands within & adjoining the monument. | Would have reduced effectiveness in the 280-acre intensive use area.<br>Same as Alternative B   |
| Visual Resources Management (VRM)<br>VRM Class I acres<br>Class II acres (monument)<br>Class III acres (monument)<br>Class IV acres |  |   | Long-term protection of geologic features would be provided by proper location of recreational signing & facility location.  | Same as Alternative B   |
| Water   |  | 0<br>4,124<br>0<br>0  | 0<br>3,030<br>1,094**<br>0<br>**(w/less restrictive facility development compliance)   | 0<br>2,004<br>2,120<br>0  |
|   |  | Trampling of vegetation & development of social trails on 155 acres of intensive use area would result in increased erosion & delivery of sedimentation to stream channels.   | Trampling of vegetation & development of social trails on 241 acres of intensive use area would result in increased erosion & delivery of sedimentation to stream channels.  | Trampling of vegetation & development of social trails on 280 acres of intensive use area would result in increased erosion & delivery of sedimentation to stream channels. |
|   |  | Drinking water is not available in the monument.  | Drinking water would be made available that meets supply & quality needs, health & safety requirements.  | Drinking water would be made available that meets supply & quality needs, health & safety requirements.   |
| Wildlife Habitat<br>Visitor Numbers   |  | Visitation could reach 150,000/year. Most direct impacts to wildlife would come from interaction with the visiting public.  | Management would encourage visitation at about 50,000/year. Most direct impacts to wildlife would come from interaction with the visiting  | Same as Alternative B   |

| ISSUE/Element or Factor  | ALTERNATIVE A   | ALTERNATIVE B  | ALTERNATIVE C   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p><b><u>Issue 3: Recreational Activities</u></b> (concl'd)<br/>Wildlife Habitat, concl'd<br/>Fragmentation (per square mile of federal habitat)</p> | <p>Approximately 2.98 miles of road &amp; 1.28 miles of trails.<br/>The potential exists for indirect &amp; long-term effects from noxious weed introduction.<br/>The 155 acres used for intensive recreation by as many as 150,000 visitors/year would have little opportunity to develop diverse, healthy vegetation.</p>         | <p>public.<br/>Approximately 1.5 miles of road &amp; 1.23 miles of trails.<br/>Same as Alternative A</p>   | <p>Approximately 1.79 miles of road &amp; 1.5 miles of trails.<br/>Same as Alternative A</p>  |
| <p>Vegetation &amp; Woodland Management</p>  | <p>The 155 acres used for intensive recreation by as many as 150,000 visitors/year would have little opportunity to develop diverse, healthy vegetation.</p>  | <p>The 241 acres used for intensive recreation by as many as 50,000 visitors/year would have little opportunity to develop diverse, healthy vegetation.</p>  | <p>The 280 acres used for intensive recreation by as many as 50,000 visitors/year would have little opportunity to develop diverse, healthy vegetation.</p> |
| <p><b><u>Issue 4: Ecosystem Restoration</u></b><br/>Access &amp; Transportation</p>  | <p>Close 0.0 miles of road<br/>Close 0.4 miles of trail, rehabilitate by natural &amp;/or mechanical means.<br/>Retire 4,088 federal acres from grazing allotments. This would help to return to a natural fire regime, reduce potential for catastrophic fire, improve watershed conditions, &amp; improve ecologic diversity.</p> | <p>Close 9.5 miles of road, rehabilitate by natural &amp;/or mechanical means.<br/>Close 2.1 miles of trail, rehabilitate by natural &amp;/or mechanical means.<br/>Same as Alternative A, except short-term grazing could be permitted to advance the purposes of the proclamation.</p> | <p>Close 7.6 miles of road, rehabilitate by natural &amp;/or mechanical means.<br/>Same as Alternative A<br/>Same as Alternative B</p>                      |
| <p>Rangeland/Livestock Grazing</p>   | <p>Retire 4,088 federal acres from grazing allotments. This would help to return to a natural fire regime, reduce potential for catastrophic fire, improve watershed conditions, &amp; improve ecologic diversity.</p>  | <p>Same as Alternative A, except short-term grazing could be permitted to advance the purposes of the proclamation.</p>  | <p>Same as Alternative B</p>  |
| <p>Vegetation &amp; Woodland Treatment</p>   | <p>610 acres of treatment would result in long-term vegetative health &amp; diversity &amp; improved watershed condition.</p>   | <p>Same as Alternative A, except identified &amp;/or recommended acquisition could increase the acres of treatment.</p>  | <p>Same as Alternative B</p>  |
| <p>Riparian Areas</p>  | <p>Exclosures &amp; monitoring would lead to expansion of riparian habitat areas where possibility is demonstrated. Need for exclosures &amp; monitoring would be reevaluated at the end of 5 years unless positive results have been occurring.</p>  | <p>Same as Alternative A, except identified &amp; recommended acquisition could lead to expansion of the exclosures, monitoring &amp; riparian habitat area.</p>   | <p>Same as Alternative B</p>  |
| <p><b><u>Issue 5: American Indian Uses &amp; Traditional Cultural Practices</u></b><br/>Access &amp; Transportation</p>                              | <p>Intrusion of many miles of road would result in loss of privacy in highly valued traditional use area.</p>   | <p>Miles of road in traditional use area reduced by 3 to 5 miles.<br/>Infrequent short-term closures could be requested on open roads &amp; trails.<br/>Affected tribes &amp; pueblos would be consulted on access &amp; transportation activities.</p>                                  | <p>Same as Alternative A<br/>Same as Alternative B<br/>Same as Alternative B</p>  |

| ISSUE/Element or Factor   | ALTERNATIVE A  | ALTERNATIVE B         | ALTERNATIVE C         |
|---|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|   | Intrusion of 5.9 miles of improved road would cause loss of privacy in highly valued traditional use area.                   | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A |
| <b><u>Issue 5: American Indian Uses &amp; Traditional Cultural Practices</u></b> , concluded Traditional Use Concerns | Close day-to-day consultation with Pueblo de Cochiti.  | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A |
|   | Consultation with other tribes as required for NEPA, NHPA, & NAGPRA.   | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A |
|   | Cultural Resources<br>Consultation with tribes as required for cultural resource compliance.                                 | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A |
| Environmental Justice   | Pueblo de Cochiti involved in management through Cooperative Management Agreement; consultation with other tribes & pueblos. | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A |